

1 HANSON BRIDGETT LLP  
KURT A. FRANKLIN, SBN 172715  
2 kfranklin@hansonbridgett.com  
LISA M. POOLEY, SBN 168737  
3 lpooley@hansonbridgett.com  
SAMANTHA WOLFF, SBN 240280  
4 swolff@hansonbridgett.com  
RUSSELL C. PETERSEN, SBN 264245  
5 russ.petersen@hansonbridgett.com  
CANDICE P. SHIH, SBN 294251  
6 cshih@hansonbridgett.com  
425 Market Street, 26th Floor  
7 San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 777-3200  
8 Facsimile: (415) 541-9366

9 HANSON BRIDGETT LLP  
TYSON M. SHOWER, SBN 190375  
10 tshower@hansonbridgett.com  
500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1500  
11 Sacramento, California 95814  
Telephone: (916) 442-3333  
12 Facsimile: (916) 442-2348

13 OTTEN LAW, PC  
VICTOR OTTEN, SBN 165800  
14 vic@ottenlawpc.com  
KAVITA TEKCHANDANI, SBN 234873  
15 kavita@ottenlawpc.com  
3620 Pacific Coast Highway, #100  
16 Torrance, California 90505  
Telephone: (310) 378-8533  
17 Facsimile: (310) 347-4225

18 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
CORY SPENCER, DIANA MILENA  
19 REED, and COASTAL PROTECTION  
RANGERS, INC.  
20

21 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
22 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION**  
23

24 CORY SPENCER, an individual;  
25 DIANA MILENA REED, an  
individual; and COASTAL  
26 PROTECTION RANGERS, INC., a  
27 California non-profit public benefit  
corporation,  
28

CASE NO. 2:16-cv-02129-SJO (RAOx)

**PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO  
DEFENDANT BRANT BLAKEMAN'S  
OBJECTION TO MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE OLIVER'S MINUTE ORDER  
OF MARCH 29, 2018**

Case No. 2:16-cv-02129-SJO (RAOx)

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT BRANT BLAKEMAN'S OBJECTION TO  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE OLIVER'S MINUTE ORDER OF MARCH 29, 2018

1  
2 Plaintiffs,

3 v.

4 LUNADA BAY BOYS; THE  
5 INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE  
6 LUNADA BAY BOYS, including but  
7 not limited to SANG LEE, BRANT  
8 BLAKEMAN, ALAN JOHNSTON  
9 AKA JALIAN JOHNSTON,  
10 MICHAEL RAE PAPAYANS,  
11 ANGELO FERRARA, FRANK  
12 FERRARA, CHARLIE FERRARA,  
and N. F.; CITY OF PALOS VERDES  
ESTATES; CHIEF OF POLICE JEFF  
KEPLEY, in his representative  
capacity; and DOES 1-10,

13 Defendants.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Complaint Filed: March 29, 2016

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## **Page**

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. RELEVANT FACTS ..... 1

III. ARGUMENT ..... 2

    A. This Court Should Not Consider Defendant Blakeman’s  
        Objection Because It Is Procedurally Improper..... 2

    B. Even If Defendant Blakeman Had Filed The Required Motion,  
        This Court Should Not Consider His Objection Because It Is  
        Untimely..... 3

IV. CONCLUSION ..... 4

## I. INTRODUCTION

This Court should reject Defendant Blakeman's Objection to Magistrate Judge Oliver's March 29, 2018 Order. To start, it is procedurally improper in that he failed to file a motion for review, as required by Local Rule 72-2.1. Additionally, his "Objection" is untimely under both Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 72-2.1. Given Defendant Blakeman's failure to comply with the Court's rules and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court need not and should not consider his Objection.

## II. RELEVANT FACTS

On October 30, 2017, Plaintiffs filed an *Ex Parte* Application for an Order Setting Hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanctions against Defendants Brant Blakeman and the City of Palos Verdes Estates. (Dkt. No. 508.) The *Ex Parte* Application included Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanctions against Defendants Blakeman and the City of Palos Verdes Estates. (Dkt. Nos. 508-2, 508-3.)

On December 13, 2017, Magistrate Judge Oliver issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report"), in part recommending that Plaintiffs be granted monetary sanctions in the form of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred by Plaintiffs in bringing their Motion for Sanctions against Defendant Blakeman. (Dkt. No. 538.)

On December 27, 2017, Defendant Blakeman filed an Objection to Magistrate Judge Oliver's Report. (Dkt. No. 541.) On January 9, 2018, Plaintiffs filed their Response to Defendant Blakeman's Objection to the Report. (Dkt. No. 543.)

On February 12, 2018, this Court concurred with and adopted Magistrate Judge Oliver's Report. (Dkt. No. 544.) The Court directed Plaintiffs to submit a declaration in support of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. (*Id.* at p. 5.) The Court further directed that "[t]he amount of monetary sanctions shall be determined by the Magistrate Judge upon the further submissions of the parties." (*Id.*)

1 After the Court granted summary judgment to the City of Palos Verdes  
 2 Estates and Chief Kepley, and declined jurisdiction over the state law claims, on  
 3 February 15, 2018, Magistrate Judge Oliver issued an Order advancing the deadlines  
 4 for the parties' submissions regarding attorneys' fees and costs. (Dkt. No. 546.)

5 On February 22, 2018, Plaintiffs' counsel filed their declarations in support of  
 6 a monetary award. (Dkt. Nos. 550, 551.) On March 1, 2018, Defendant Blakeman  
 7 filed a brief in response. (Dkt. No. 552.)

8 On March 29, 2018, Magistrate Judge Oliver issued an Order regarding the  
 9 Monetary Sanctions against Defendant Blakeman. (Dkt. No. 568.)

### 10 III. ARGUMENT

#### 11 A. This Court Should Not Consider Defendant Blakeman's Objection 12 Because It Is Procedurally Improper

13 This Court should reject Defendant Blakeman's Objection to Magistrate  
 14 Judge Oliver's Order because he failed to file a noticed motion as required. Local  
 15 Rule 72-2.1 provides in relevant part:

16 Any party objecting under F.R.Civ.P 72(a) to a Magistrate  
 17 Judge's ruling on a pretrial matter not dispositive of a  
 18 claim or defense *must file a motion for review* by the  
 19 assigned District Judge, designating the specific portions  
 of the ruling objected to and stating the grounds for the  
 objection.

20 L.R. 72-2.1 (emphasis added).

21 Defendant Blakeman did not file a motion for review as required by Local  
 22 Rule 72-2.1. And connected with that failure, he did not meet and confer with  
 23 Plaintiffs as would be required before filing the motion. *See* L.R. 7-3.

24 Plaintiffs are entitled to statutory notice and the requisite amount of time to  
 25 file an opposition on the merits to a proper motion for review, after Defendant  
 26 Blakeman complies with his obligation to meet and confer. Plaintiffs have been  
 27 deprived of that opportunity and the Court should not consider his Objection.  
 28

**B. Even If Defendant Blakeman Had Filed The Required Motion, This Court Should Not Consider His Objection Because It Is Untimely**

Plaintiffs' Objection to Magistrate Judge Oliver's Order is untimely and should not be considered by the Court. Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides:

When a pretrial matter not dispositive of a party's claim or defense is referred to a magistrate judge to hear and decide, the magistrate judge must promptly conduct the required proceedings and, when appropriate, issue a written order stating the decision. *A party may serve and file objections to the order within 14 days after being served with a copy. A party may not assign as error a defect in the order not timely objected to.* The district judge in the case must consider timely objections and modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) (emphasis added).

Similarly, Local Rule 72-2.1 provides that a motion for review of a Magistrate Judge's ruling on a nondispositive matter "shall be filed ... within fourteen (14) days of service of a written ruling." L. R. 72-2.1.

After this Court concurred with and accepted Magistrate Judge Oliver's Report and Recommendation, it referred the matter of determining the amount of monetary sanctions to Magistrate Judge Oliver. (Dkt. No.544.) Magistrate Judge Oliver issued the Order to which Defendant Blakeman now objects on March 29, 2018. (Dkt. No. 568.) Defendant Blakeman was simultaneously served (by electronic means) with the Order on March 29, 2018. (*Id.*) Thus, pursuant to FRCP 72(a) and Local Rule 72-2.1, Defendant Blakeman had 14 days from March 29, 2018, or until April 12, 2018, to file his Objection. He did not do so. Rather, on April 13, 2018, without offering any explanation or excuse for missing the deadline, Defendant Blakeman filed his Objection. (Dkt. No. 571.)

Because his Objection is untimely, Defendant Blakeman is precluded from challenging any alleged error in Magistrate Judge Oliver's Order. Fed. R. Civ. P.

1 72(a). Further, because Defendant Blakeman's Objection is untimely, this Court  
2 should not consider it.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 This Court need not, and should not, consider Defendant Blakeman's  
5 improper and untimely Objection. If the Court decides to consider it, however, then  
6 Plaintiffs respectfully request that they be given the statutory amount of time to  
7 oppose it on the merits, which they would have had if Defendant had filed a proper  
8 motion.

9  
10 DATED: April 17, 2018

HANSON BRIDGETT LLP

11  
12  
13 By: /s/ Lisa M. Pooley

KURT A. FRANKLIN

LISA M. POOLEY

SAMANTHA D. WOLFF

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

14 CORY SPENCER, DIANA MILENA  
15 REED, and COASTAL PROTECTION  
16 RANGERS, INC.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28